



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/016,689	12/05/2001	Russell P. Lentini	12394-01/JWE	2596

7590 04/20/2006  
STRADLING YOCCA CARLSON & RAUTH  
IP Department  
660 Newport Center Drive, Suite 1600  
P.O. Box 7680  
Newport Beach, CA 92660-6441

EXAMINER
----------

SALAD, ABDULLAHI ELM I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/016,689

Applicant(s)

LENTINI ET AL.

Examiner

Salad E. Abdullahi

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 16-21 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,9-12,22 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8 and 13-15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**Response to Amendment**

1. The response/Amendment filed on 2/6/2006 has been received and made of record.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1-5, 9-12 and 22-23 have been fully considered but are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. Claims 16-21 are allowed.
4. Claims 6-8 and 13-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 9-12 and 22-23 have been considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant alleges references does not teach requesting related content from collaborating sites.

Examiner respectfully disagrees because Huang discloses a collaborative proxy system including requesting related content from collaborating sites (i.e., collaborating content server) (see col. 3, lines 38-49 and col. 7, lines 22-42).

Also, Jamtgaard discloses wherein the server appliance comprises for executing a series of transactions with the web server on behalf of the user prior to the user accessing a session with the web server (see fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 31-47).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jamtgaard et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,430,624.

As per claim 22, Jamtgaard discloses a system for collaborative exchange of Web based content information between and among disparate and unrelated content sources, the system comprising:

at least a web content server (13), disposed at a facility, the facility belonging to a particular content provider, the provider providing content through the web server(see fig. 4 and col. 6, lines 32-67);

a server appliance(44), electronically disposed between the web server and a wide area communication network, the appliance terminating a HTTP session directed to the web server and initiating a HTTP session with the web server as a substitute(see fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 31-47); and

a network client (15), the client operatively responsive to user input commands and coupled to communicate over the wide area communication network(see fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 31-47); and

Art Unit: 2157

wherein the server appliance comprises for executing a series of transactions with the web server on behalf of the user prior to the user accessing a session with the web server (see fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 31-47).

As per claim 23, Jamtgaard discloses the system according to claim 22, further comprising a proxy URL providing an entry point to the session from which the user can continue the session at a point of completion of execution of series of transactions (see col. 7, lines 31-47).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-5, and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jamtgaard et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,430,624 in view of Huang et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,438,576[hereinafter Huang].

As per claim 1, Jamtgaard discloses a system for collaborative exchange of Web based content information between and among disparate and unrelated content sources, the system comprising:

at least a web content server (13), disposed at a facility, the facility belonging to a particular content provider, the provider providing content through the web server (see fig. 4 and col. 6, lines 32-67);

Art Unit: 2157

a server appliance (44), electronically disposed between the web server and a wide area communication network, the appliance terminating a HTTP session directed to the web server and initiating a HTTP session with the web server as a substitute (see fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 31-47); and

a content collaboration engine (40), the engine hosted on the server appliance, the content collaboration engine further comprising;

a content recognition engine, the recognition engine receiving content from the web server in response to the HTTP session initiated by the appliance, the recognition engine converting received content to DOM, the recognition engine further classifying content in accordance with XML recognition rules (see fig. 6 and col. 9, lines 48-63);

and a content mapping engine(42) , the mapping engine extracting content definition fields from classified content and, the requested content having content definition fields including values substantially the same as the extracted content definition fields (see col. 8, lines 62 to col. 9, line 39 and col. 10, lines 21-47) .

Jamtgaard is silent regarding: requesting related content from collaborating sites.

Huang discloses a collaborative proxy system including requesting related content from collaborating sites (i.e., collaborating content server) (see col. 3, lines 38-49 and col. 7, lines 22-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the content collaboration mechanism as taught by Huang in order to facilitate document exchange among collaborating server.

As per claim 2, Jamtgaard discloses the system according to claim 1, further comprising

Art Unit: 2157

a content fusion engine, the fusion engine integrating related content received from collaborating sites with classified content, the fusion engine converting the fused content to a desired output format (see col. 10, lines 21-47).

As per claim 3, Jamtgaard discloses the system according to claim 2, wherein the desired output format is selected from a group consisting of HTML, WML, XML, and PDF (see col. 4, line 58 to col. 5, line 6).

As per claims 4 and 5, Jamtgaard discloses the system according to claim 2, further comprising:

a network gateway (see fig. 2, element 14);

a network management agent (appliance connection controller) (see col. 7, lines 13-47); and

wherein the server appliance is coupled to the network management agent, the agent configured to redirect HTTP requests made to the content server to the appliance(see col. 7, lines 13-47).

As per claim 6, Huang discloses the system according to claim 2, further comprising:

a consortium of content sources (content sharing proxies) (see figs.1 and 4 and col. 3, lines 38-49 and col. 7, lines 22-42);

a content category structure definition (see figs.1 and 4 and col. 3, lines 38-49 and col. 7, lines 22-42).

Art Unit: 2157

a request for information protocol (see figs.1 and 4 and col. 3, lines 38-49 and col. 7, lines 22-42);

wherein the content category structure definition comprises a format for categorizing all content sources collaborating in the exchange of content within the consortium(see figs.1 and 4 and col. 3, lines 38-49 and col. 7, lines 22-42).

As per claim 7-8, Jamtgaard discloses the system according to claim 6, wherein the request for information protocol comprises a format for defining a structure that identifies valid content fields a content provider can be queried against in order to identify and recover content from a specific category categorized by the content category structure definition (see col. 6, lines 54-67).

As per claim 9, Jamtgaard discloses a system for exchanging Web based content information between and among disparate and unrelated content sources, a method for collaborative exchange of related content, the method comprising:

providing content through at least a web server, disposed at a facility, the facility belonging to a particular content provider(see fig. 4 and col. 6, lines 32-67);

electronically disposing a server appliance between the web server and a wide area communication network, the appliance terminating a HTTP session directed to the web server and initiating a HTTP session with the web server as a substitute; and

receiving content from the web server in response to the HTTP session initiated by the appliance(see fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 31-47);



Art Unit: 2157

converting received content to DOM(see fig. 6, and col. 9, lines 48-63);

classifying content in accordance with XML recognition rules(see fig. 7, and col. 10, lines 21-47); and

extracting content definition fields from classified content (col. 10, lines 21-47).

Jamtgaard is silent regarding: requesting related content from collaborating sites.

Huang discloses a collaborative proxy system including requesting related content from collaborating sites (i.e., collaborating content server) (see col. 3, lines 38-49). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the content collaboration mechanism as taught by Huang in order to facilitate document exchange among collaborating server.

As per claim 10, Jamtgaard discloses the method according to claim 9, further comprising: requesting related content from collaborating sites, the requested content having content definition fields including values substantially the same as the extracted content definition fields (see col. 10, lines 48-56); and integrating related content received from collaborating sites with classified content (col. 10, lines 21-47).

As per claims 11-12, Jamtgaard discloses the method according to claim 10, further comprising the step of converting the fused content to a desired output format, wherein the desired output format is selected from a group consisting of HTML, WML, XML, and PDF (see col. 4, line 58 to col. 5, line 6).

Art Unit: 2157

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

***Conclusion***


10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Salad E Abdullahi whose telephone number is 571-272-4009. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Art Unit: 2157

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

As  
4/16/2006

  
ABDULLAH SALAD  
PRIMARY EXAMINER